REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are present in this application. Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, and 15 are independent claims.

§ 103(a) Rejection – McDonough, Millington

Claims 1-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,163,749 (McDonough) in view of U.S. Patent 6,178,380 (Millington; newly cited).

Claims 1, 6, 11

Claim 1 recites a content display apparatus having, among other things, "a control means for suppressing display of at least one of the objects based on said priorities among the objects included in said content when said calculated complexity exceeds an upper limit of <u>processing capability of the apparatus</u>."

As disclosed in the present application, complexities are set for display of characters, images and graphic symbols in accordance with the models of the mobile phones. Figure 4 shows examples of priorities of objects and complexities for plotting the objects. Figure 5 shows an upper limit of complexity for different terminals and associated expressions for calculating complexity. According to the present specification, the individual values and the expression for calculation are determined based on the plotting speed for each item of the respective objects and from experience (specification at paragraph bridging pages 10-11).

The Office Action alleges that "McDonough teaches the limitations of claims 1-17 with the exception of explicitly teaching the calculated complexity exceeding an upper limit." The Office Action instead alleges that "Millington teaches a navigation system that zooms in and out based on display complexity." (bottom of page 2 of the Office Action).

Millington discloses a navigation system that displays a map over a variable scale. Millington takes into account complexity such that when the variable scale exceeds a threshold scale (zoomed out), the system no longer displays the associated names in the current road segment name field (col. 4, lines 34-40). The threshold is set at a scale that displays a map that is not overly complex or detailed (col. 4, lines 26-29).

CG/RWD/

In other words, it can be seen that complexity in Millington is synonymous with the amount of detail (Millington at column 4, lines 26-29). Road names are suppressed when scale of the display exceeds a threshold.

Unlike Millington, the threshold in the claimed invention is "an upper limit of processing capability of the display apparatus" (i.e., is based on the characteristics of the display apparatus). The threshold in Millington is a scale at which a road names are displayed in a map, i.e., a display complexity. Applicant submits that Millington's scale threshold is not a limit of processing capability.

In order to clarify these differences over Millington's "scale," as well as McDonough's "conflicts check," Applicant has amended the claims to further define "complexity" as it relates to the capability of the display apparatus, e.g., as being calculated based on "plotting speed" The claim amendment is based on the specification at paragraph bridging pages 10-11.

Applicant submits that Millington and McDonough, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose all features recited in claim 1 as amended, of a content display apparatus which comprises "complexity calculating means for calculating complexity in displaying said content based on plotting speed to display each object of said plurality of objects."

Claims 6 and 11 have been amended in a similar manner as claim 1 based on the disclosure in the specification relating to "complexity."

Claims 5, 10, 15

Claims 5, 10, and 15 cover the aspect of displaying animation formed of a plurality of frames. According to the present specification (third embodiment), complexity is calculated each time a frame is plotted, and the content is reproduced as much as possible using the configuration in the first and second embodiment. For a frame exceeding the upper limit of complexity, a certain process such as skipping of the frame may be performed.

Thus, claim 5 has been amended to recite that the complexity is based on plotting speed to display a relevant frame, such that the display of the frame which has a complexity exceeding an upper limit is suppressed. Claims 10 and 15 have been amended in a similar manner.

CG/RWD/

Applicant submits that McDonough and Millington, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose suppressing display of the frame for which the calculated complexity exceeds an upper limit of complexity, in which the complexity is calculated based on plotting speed to display the relevant frame, as recited in claims 5, 10, and 15.

Claims 3, 8, 13

Embodiments of the present invention covered by claim 3, 8, 13 include a feature of invalidating part of the functions of the display apparatus. For example, functions that are for reproducing certain types of objects may be too complex in newer phones. Subsequently, when reproduction is too complex, a function for reproducing an object can be set off ("invalidated"). (specification at page 6, second paragraph from bottom).

In particular, as shown in Fig. 12 an example embodiment is disclosed in which object plotting functions and associated complexities are set for a terminal device. In the disclosed example, a graphic symbol has several plotting functions. If the complexity of one of the plotting functions causes the overall complexity to exceed the capability of the display apparatus, the function having the highest complexity can be invalidated.

The Examiner alleges that McDonough teaches that layer switching distances (94) are points at which the map display tool adds or deletes information (invalidating) from the display. (Office Action at page 7). Applicant submits that deleting information from a display does not constitute invalidating "functions" of a display device.

The Office Action also alleges that suppressing names of road segments of Millington can be considered as "invalidating." (Office Action at page 8).

In order to clarify the intended meaning of invalidating part of the functions of the display apparatus, claim 3 has been amended to recite "control means for invalidating one or more of the plurality of functions for displaying objects using the display apparatus and displaying said objects using remaining functions of said plurality of functions chosen based on

CG/RWD/

said processing complexity, said priorities, and an upper limit of processing capability of the apparatus."

Claims 8 and 13 have been amended in a similar fashion.

Applicant submits that McDonough and Millington, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose invalidating one or more functions for displaying objects based on processing complexity, priorities and an upper limit of processing capability, as recited in claims 3, 8, and 13.

At least for these reasons, Applicant requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

CG/RWD/

Comments

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact **Robert Downs** Reg. No. 48,222 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: August 3, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By *Robert Downs* # 48222

Charles Gorenstein
Registration No.: 29,271
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant

CG/RWD/